DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 409 SO 013 221

AUTHOR Kitano, Margie
TITLE A Re-Examination of Educational Issues.
PUB DATE 17 Feb 81
NOTE 26p.: A presentation in the College of Education Dialogue Series (Las Cruces, NM, February 17, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Anthropology; Curriculum Development; Decision Making; *Educational Anthropology; *Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnocentrism; Higher Education; Leadership Training; Multicultural Education

ABSTRACT

This paper suggests how an anthropological perspective can help educators rethink important educational issues, including multicultural education, leadership training, and educational processes. Opening sections of the paper define anthropology (the study of human beings and their ways of life), and identify anthropological concepts and principles which have particular relevance for education. Concepts discussed include inculturation (the process by which culturally accepted behaviors are transmitted); culture conflict (differences between main culture and subcultures regarding goals, beliefs, and behaviors); and cultural relativism (the belief that cultural elements cannot be evaluated against standards drawn from another culture). Principles identified as being most relevant for education include the assumption that all human beings have the same potential for learning and the assumption that all aspects of a society are interrelated. Case studies are offered regarding the potential applications of anthropology to multicultural education and leadership training. For example, it is suggested that, in the case of multicultural education, anthropology can help educators maintain a balance between a culturally relativist perspective (i.e., respecting the integrity of different cultures) and universal goals (i.e. providing literacy in the majority language while helping children retain their first language. In the case of leadership training, educators can incorporate anthropological perspectives into various areas, including setting objectives, clarifying the conflict between traditional and emergent values, and identifying the relative importance of intellectual, moral, and technical skills. The conclusion is that application of an anthropological perspective to educational issues can aid in their resolution by helping to clarify opposing values and by making educators more sensitive to practices and values of subcultures in the school and in society. (DB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED205409

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dr. Margie Kitano

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# A RE-EXAMINATION OF EDUCATIONAL ISSUES

A Presentation in the College of Education

DIALOGUE SERIES

New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico

by

Margie Kitano, Ph.D.
College of Education
New Mexico State University

SO 013 221

February 17, 1981

A RE-EXAMINATION OF EDUCATIONAL ISSUES

This paper represents an early effort to consider some fundamental concepts of anthropology as they might apply to educational issues. My study of anthropology and related social sciences is being supported by a W. K. Kellogg National Fellowship for a three-year period which began last August. I am pleased to present the following thoughts on anthropology and education to my colleagues, with the expectations that these thoughts will change and mature over the next few years.

## Introduction

Toward the end of the 1960's, several anthropologists (Berreman, 1968; Gjessing, 1968; Gough, 1968) began to question the relevance of anthropology to life in a rapidly changing world. While humankind developed technological and cultural innovations that threatened its own existence, traditional scholars of the study of human beings were continuing to focus on esoteric, ivory tower topics such as witchcraft and kinship ties among "primitive" peoples.

A solution to the waning vitality of the field was proposed: make anthropology more relevant. Toward this end, anthropologists are currently seeking to apply their skills and knowledge to health services, urban problems, and education. In education, the focus of this paper, much has been written on the use of anthropological content in all levels of the curriculum--that is, what should be taught to

elementary, secondary, and college students about anthropology (e.g., Emmons & Cobia, 1968; Leeds, 1968; Rosenfeld, 1968). The contribution of anthropological methods to educational research is being acknowledged to an increasingly greater degree (e.g., Wilson, 1977). These methods include participant observation and other ethnographic techniques. A third, more significant but less recognized contribution concerns the value of the anthropological perspective in considering educational policy decisions.

This paper will suggest how the anthropological perspective can help educators rethink such important issues as the futures of multicultural education and leadership training in a technological era. A brief background will be offered to circumscribe the domain and define relevant concepts. Applications of the anthropological perspective to major educational issues will then be discussed.

## Background

Relevant background information includes a definition of anthropology as a field, a discussion of pertinent concepts, and a brief history of anthropology and education.

### The Field of Anthropology

Anthropology is the study of human beings and their ways of life. While authorities disagree on the precise taxonomy of sub-disciplines, the field includes physical anthropology, cultural anthropology, anthropological linguistics, and archaeology (Aceves & King, 1979). Physical anthropology concerns physical variations among human

populations, tracing the evolution of human beings and their adaptation to the environment. Cultural anthropology examines similarities and differences among cultures. Anthropological linguistics, the study of languages and their sound systems, and archaeology, the study of past civilizations based on analyses of material remains, are sometimes considered specializations within cultural anthropology (Kneller, 1965). The concern of this paper is cultural anthropology, conceived less broadly as the study of living cultures.

The content of cultural anthropology overlaps to some extent that of other disciplines. The study of culture and personality, for example, has elements in common with psychology. Principles of sociology and social psychology may be evident in the study of social institutions and roles. Investigations of a culture's development will invariably bring in history, economics, and the arts. Anthropology is unique, however, in its holistic approach. Every element of a culture--weaving, for example--is examined only in relation to the culture as a whole.

## Relevant Concepts

Culture and the holistic anthropological approach have relevance to educational problems and deserve further explanation. Other pertinent concepts include cultural relativism, cultural universalism, and culture conflict.

Culture. Culture in the broadest sense refers to all ways of life evolved by human beings in society (Kneller, 1965). A specific culture is generally defined as a system of beliefs, thoughts, and

behaviors learned and shared by members of a society and expressed through its social institutions (e.g., religion, law), language, customs, arts, and material goods (tools, shelters, clothing). That culture is learned distinguishes it from genetically transmitted or instinctive behavior. The process by which culturally accepted behaviors are transmitted is referred to as enculturation. Culture is shared in that the behaviors are practiced by all or a significant part of the society. A group of people within a larger population whose members share a set of beliefs and customs sometimes different from that of the larger population comprise a subculture. Black Americans and White Appalachians are examples of subcultures in the United States. It should be emphasized that, as within the larger culture, not all of the people within these subcultures share the same beliefs and behaviors.

With its many subcultures and social institutions, the American culture lacks complete integration. That is, the institutions within the culture are not mutually supportive in reaching common goals. Religion, for example, is by law separate from public education. Lack of integration results in two types of culture conflict. First, when the goals, beliefs, and behaviors of a subculture differ from those of the main culture, members of the subculture may experience conflict as they attempt to participate in the majority group's social institutions (e.g., schools, courts, and marketplace). Language differences are a case in point.

A second type of conflict occurs within a culture or subculture

and stems from the existence of discrepant values within the culture. One such conflict is that between ideal and real or manifest cultural values. Simply stated, the ideals promulgated by the society differ from its practices (Kneller, 1965). We can see such conflict in operation when the culture promotes goals but does not permit means whereby all members can attain them. The belief that material success is achievable by anyone through hard work exemplifies the conflict between ideal and real culture. Another type of within-culture conflict is that between traditional and emergent values, as exemplified by the old and "new" morality. The concepts of culture and culture conflict are integral to the anthropological perspective.

The anthropological perspective. Like other disciplines, anthropology maintains a set of assumptions that define its perspective. One assumption is that, in general, all human beings, regardless of cultural group, ethnicity, or sex, have the same potential for learning (Aceves & King, 1979). A second principle is that any given aspect of a society--its religious practices, sports, arts, educational system--does not exist in isolation. Each is interpretable only within a distinct cultural context (Price-Williams & Gallimore, 1980). An anthropologist interested in the sculpture of a society, for example, would examine how sculpture relates to every aspects of the society's culture. The anthropologist might consider the social position of sculptors, their selection and training, the meaning of their products, the time and conditions of product use. Similarly, a socio-cultural view on special education might suggest that labeling

the handicapped creates a number of institutions and hence a multitude of jobs, at the same time supporting the perpetuation of a lower social class necessary in a capitalistic society (Price-Williams & Gallimore, 1980).

A third, related assumption that contributes to the anthropological perspective is that of cultural relativism. From the viewpoint of relativism, a culture or element of a culture cannot be evaluated against standards drawn from another culture. No culture is intrinsically good or bad, and each must be understood only within its specific cultural situation. Polygymy, for example, may contribute to the well being of a particular culture where there is a high ratio of adult females to adult males or where the practice results in raising the status of women.

Opposing cultural relativism is cultural universalism, the idea that there are common values and standards appropriate to rational human beings. From a universalist viewpoint, for example, one who believes in the supremacy of human life would judge as immoral a culture that practices infanticide. As early as the 16th Century and continuing after Darwin's 1859 publication, On the Origin of Species, the universalist viewpoint predominated in the idea of cultural evolution (Aceves & King, 1979). Societies, it was thought, could be arranged along a continuum from the least evolved ("savages") to the most highly evolved ("civilizations"). Evolutionary thought was reinforced by 19th Century colonial expansion and characterized by considerable ethnocentrism. It was at the beginning of the 20th

Century that Franz Boas demonstrated the superiority of cultural over racial/genetic explanations for observed differences between human groups. While the relativist viewpoint has replaced early evolutionary bias, the idea of the existence of cultural universals continues to be of interest in the field.

The anthropological perspective and related concepts of culture, conflict, and relativism have obvious relevance for education. The last background section briefly describes the history of the association between anthropology and education.

Anthropology and Education

The history of anthropology and education has been described as "peculiar" (Roberts, 1976) for the following reason. While anthropologists and educators both are vitally concerned with culture, particularly enculturation, few anthropologists before the 1960's directly studied educational institutions. One explanation concerns the anthropologist's broader view of education as including many more aspects of life than formal schooling. Moreover, the cultures studied by traditional anthropologists generally lacked formal educational institutions. It has been argued (Roberts, 1976), however, that the main reason for the sparcity of anthropological investigations of formal education has been a failure to recognize teaching as a profession worthy of study. Contributing to this attitude was the fact that the teaching field has been predominantly occupied by women. Fortunately, anthropologists are becoming increasingly cognizant of their formerly unrecognized male bias and of the ways in which that

bias has distorted perceptions of cultural activities involving women.

In light of current educational concerns regarding early childhood and multicultural education, it is interesting to note that the first literature applying anthropology to education dealt with these topics (Roberts, 1976). Nina Vandewalker in 1898 called for an anthropological study of childhood and stressed the child's need to learn about children in different cultures. Seven years later, Edgar Hewett argued for an educational policy sensitive to the fact that individuals from different cultural groups may hold different views on what constitutes honor and morality.

Despite these encouraging beginnings, it was not until the Civil Rights movement of the 1960's that the fields of anthropology and education began to join together (LaBelle, 1976). Professionals in both fields recognized the potential contributions of anthropological investigation of schools to the understanding of minority problems. As a result, the American Anthropological Association in 1968 formed the Council on Anthropology and Education, whose concern continues to be the application of anthropological concepts and methods to the study of education. The remainder of this paper is devoted to the application of the anthropological perspective to major educational issues, as a critical step toward their solution in ways that insure the dignity of all people.

## Applications to Educational Issues

Anthropology has important contributions to make in the areas of curriculum content, teacher training, analysis of educational

processes, and research on factors affecting school achievement (Spindler, 1973). A contribution equally as significant and perhaps more so is in the application of the anthropological perspective to educational issues. Anthropology can serve to identify educational culture conflicts in relation to the greater social context and thus clarify choices for informed decision making. Two major issues to which anthropology can be applied in this regard are multicultural education and leadership training. It should be cautioned that the conclusions of this section, logically drawn, need verification by research.

Multicultural Education

A major problem facing multicultural education today is not whether such programs should exist, but rather what the objectives should be. The approach taken will be to discuss the rationale for multicultural education from a cultural relativist perspective, the limitations of relativism in general and as applied to the specific case of multicultural education, and a potential solution.

Rationale: cultural relativism. Even during the ethnocentric period of colonial expansion, ideas emerged to support the concept of an educational system that respected the integrity of different cultures. Bronislaw Malinowski (1936), writing in the context of South African colonialism, espoused the relativist position that European schools must respect African values while simultaneously preparing African students for living in a European world. Though intermixed with universalist conceptions, Malinowski made several

points in support of society's responsibility to maintain African culture. First, many African customs and practices contribute positively to the culture's well-being. These practices need to be understood by educators, because to divorce schooling from African culture will lead to a breakdown of tribal life. Second, European and African education must occur at the same time and in conscious harmony. Failure will result in conflict within the individual and disintegration of the community. Moreover, the African child would develop contempt for his parents and all things African, thus undermining the supportive function of the home. Finally, despite views to the contrary, African children can succeed as well as European children in school.

More recent educational anthropology literature supports and extends the relativist concept regarding the qualitative equality of cultures and consequent right of children to maintain their home culture through supportive accommodations made by the schools. LaBelle (1976), for example, suggested that the school must provide literacy in the majority language while helping children retain their first. Because of the interdependence of language and cultural tradition, to abruptly separate children from their first language is to remove them from their cultural heritage. Also, because bilingual children are necessarily bicultural, bilingual programs must include culture studies at all levels of schooling. Finally, LaBelle argued for accommodations in process as well as content. Based on Cohen's (1969) work, he noted that children of different cultural groups may possess

learning styles different from those required by the schools, and these different styles may require modifications of the instructional process.

In sum, a rationale supporting multicultural education from at least one anthropological perspective rests on the relativist viewpoint that education must be relevant to the students' cultural orientations. Instruction must be planned in accord with the students' language, values, and learning styles, with maintenance of the first culture as a prominent objective. What then, are the limitations to such a conception of multicultural education? A first step in their understanding is a critique of the relativist viewpoint.

Limitations of cultural relativism. A major worth of the cultural relativist position is that it decries ethnocentrism and legitimizes the activities of every culture. As Schmidt (1955) and Kneller (1965) have pointed out, however, this position has several limitations. First, relativism by definition denies the existence of a set of universal moral standards. For example, if every practice is acceptable within the context of its specific culture, then such activities as slavery, cannibalism, and infanticide are to be tolerated for members of that culture. Second, individual cultures cannot be improved by the adoption of superior practices and values from another culture because comparative value judgments are not consistent with the relativist position. Third, relativism would preclude honest appraisal of the human condition with respect to what might be considered the inherent rights of human beings.

These general limitations can be applied to the specific case of multicultural education. First, questioning the relevance of the school's goals to subcultural groups ignores the existence of universal goals for education. These goals may be broadly conceived as (a) preparing students for adult life, and (b) maintaining or raising the standard of living for all. Related objectives include mastery of the culture's prevalent communication system (oral or written tradition) and socialization in accord with the culture's norm. The point of confusion concerns whether by "culture" one refers to the majority culture or minority subculture. If the tasks of formal education in America are to prepare students for adult life and raise their living standards within the constraints of the majority culture, then the enculturation process must necessarily aim at majority culture practices. For schools to enculturate students in a minority subculture could be to seriously hinder their achievement of these goals.

Second, insistence on adaptations by the majority culture school ignores the possibility that the subculture may benefit from incorporation of majority culture practices. Specifically, one might question whether subcultural behaviors/practices that preclude the achievement of universally accepted objectives should be encouraged or even maintained by the schools. The cultural sanctions against direct confrontation with adults, for example, results in Hawaiian children's avoidance of eye contact with the teacher (Gallimore, personal communication). If lack of eye contact obstructs the

learning process, then the value of accommodating this behavior in the schools is questionable. With regard to first language maintenance, Malinowski notes that to replace the first language with the majority language may have a leveling and disintegrative influence. Yet, he argues, it would be preposterous to deprive minority children of the best instrument for mastering the majority environment.

Finally, a universal conception acknowledged by relativists and universalists alike is that much of a child's education is acquired outside the formal schools--in the home, church, community, and later, on the job. Prior to formal schooling, for example, children learn a great deal of their family's culture, including its language, eating habits, approved modes of adult-child interactions, and ceremonies. Malinowski's (1936) assumption that African education can be better obtained from the tribe can be applied here. Formal educational institutions might best prepare minority students for life in the main stream but in a culturally sensitive manner.

Simultaneously, the educational institutions of the subculture--home, community, church—could best serve the purposes of transmission and maintenance of the subculture, in accord with the individual family's desire to do so. It is conceivable that not every minority parent places a higher priority on first culture maintenance than majority culture literacy. Moreover, it is questionable that every teacher can be prepared to maintain the culture of the dozens of culturally different children that he/she will serve over a teaching career. Finally, there is evidence from ethnographic research

that questions the ability of multicultural education programs to achieve first-culture maintenance, and even suggests that such programs foster majority culture enculturation (Price-Williams & Gallimore, 1980).

The consideration of universal educational objectives suggests possible solutions that would both maintain the dignity of culturally different students while ensuring their rights to pursue a higher standard of living within the mainstream of society.

Toward a potential solution. A liberal universalist approach to multicultural education might include the following principles:

1. Adopting universally acceptable objectives for formal education (e.g., English literacy and socialization within dominant culture norms).

2. Selecting instructional procedures that are both consistent with these objectives and, if possible, with the target population's way of learning new information.

3. Promoting enculturation agencies outside the formal educational institution as a means for first-culture maintenance, if desired by the individual family.

One model program that illustrates some of these principles is the Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP), a research and development project founded in 1970 to discover ways to improve the educational achievement of Hawaiian children (Tharp, undated). A major objective of KEEP is to raise reading achievement in Standard English with its bidialectical students whose first language is Hawaiian Creole English (Pidgin). KEEP designers were successful in meeting

this objective by implementing a combination of strategies. First, they selected instructional methods supported by general education research (direct instruction and diagnostic-prescriptive teaching) and subsequently validated with Hawaiian children. Second, they developed instructional situations that approximated cultural events in which Hawaiian children normally manifest the target behaviors.

Previous ethnographic research related to the project indicated that Hawaiian culture is characterized by cooperation and shared-functioning, sibling caretaking, peer orientation, and avoidance of direct confrontation with adults. Consistent with these ways of behavior, one instructional situation developed consists of Independent Work Centers in which a child's only immediate source of assistance is other children working on similar assignments. Another example is the simulation of the "talk story" feature of Hawaiian culture to promote discussion of readings in an environment which normally elicits such verbal interaction (Jorden, 1980).

The issue of multicultural education can thus be examined with respect to principles of cultural universalism and cultural relativism. Consideration of universal objectives for education with culturally relevant modes of implementation may be one approach to delivery of appropriate educational services to culturally different learners. Analysis of conflict within the American culture as a whole can help clarify a second major issue, the education of future leaders.

Leadership Training

There is no doubt that a nation's future is profoundly influenced by its leaders, by those individuals in every walk of life from poet to politician whose creative efforts and decision making affect the lives of many. Leaders are needed in each institution in every culture--education, government, science, religion, art, and industry--who anticipate as well as solve problems and who plan and make decisions to the moral and material benefit of society as a whole. A crucial question for educators in this regard concerns the best way to prepare potential leaders, most of whom will participate in our formal educational institutions. Specifically, what should be the curriculum goals that will foster excellence in the leaders of tomorrow? From an anthropological perspective, analysis of the problem involves clarifying the conflict between cultural values that bear on leadership training. As discussed previously, two culture conflicts oppose ideal with real values and traditional with emergent. Dealing with these unresolved conflicts in a consistent manner may constitute a first step in the planning of a coherent and quality curriculum for leadership development.

Ideal versus real values. Educational anthropologists, examining formal schooling in a holistic manner, have criticized the school for promoting conflicting values. Ideal values, those that the culture sanctions as worth striving for, are promoted by teachers through their formal messages (e.g., in social studies lessons). Cooperation for example, might be advocated as fundamental to democracy; indepen-

dence and creativity as part of the American tradition of frontiersmanship and Yankee ingenuity. Opposing values, however, are taught through unrecognized, habitual activities which Philip Jackson (1968) refers to as the "hidden curriculum" and Jules Henry (1963) as "noise." Unrecognized activities include such rituals as hand-raising, lining up, copying models, being quiet, and being "the best." Through such activities, children learn the real values of competition, obedience, and conformity.

Anthropologists admonish educators to determine which values to promote and to organize the overt and implicit curricula to support these values with consistency. The conflicts are deeply embedded in American culture, however, and are only reflected in the schools, the enculturing agency. Resolution of such conflicts for society is beyond control of the schools.

What values, then, should be presented to the children who will ultimately use those values to determine the course of society? In the training of leaders, there is only one alternative: to teach what is honest. Educators should speak to and provide experiences that promote the ideals which the culture has identified as worth realizing. At the same time, it should be admitted and even emphasized that opposing values coexist in the culture because they contribute to the culture's continuance. Competition undergirds free enterprise and capitalism in America and is necessary to survival in the international community as it presently exists. Obedience and interdependence support democracy, which in operation depends on a

few leaders and many followers. Conformity provides a balancing structure and order that prevent chaos and anarchy. Education for leadership then, might include an honest, clear, and realistic appraisal of ideal and manifest values, with the formal and informal curricula systematically organized to support their necessary coexistence. The conflict between traditional and emergent values provides an area for further thought for curriculum planning in leadership training.

Traditional versus emergent values. Technology advances at a rapid pace. It has been estimated that 95% of accumulated knowledge will come into being within the next decade alone. Rapid technological change has resulted in conflicts between old and new values, including three particularly relevant to curricula for leadership development: (a) traditional disciplines versus current problems; (b) intellectual and ethical versus technical skill training; and (c) broad scholarship versus specialization.

The first issue addresses the question of whether curriculum emphasis on traditional disciplines or areas of current interest would best prepare future leaders for dealing with contemporary problems. Embracing the popular progressive viewpoint, many schools across the nation have responded to family disintegration, the new morality, and technological change by incorporating coursework on marriage and family life, sex education, and computer programming. Such courses might be considered temporary, to be replaced as new trends warrant. Potential leaders, however, cannot take another course for each new

problem that arises. Rather, they require a curriculum that imparts habits of humane, logical, and critical thinking that can be applied to any forthcoming issue. Educators developing curricula for leadership training might consider building strong foundations in (a) mathematics and science for systematic and logical thought, and (b) history, anthropology, literature, and the arts for a knowledge of cultural heritage and the meaning of humanity and its expression.

The issue of the relative importance of intellectual, moral, and technical skills training has been well articulated by Wallace (1973) in his anthropological analysis of schools in revolutionary and conservative societies. He noted with dismay that, reflecting contemporary cultures, the primary mission of American schools is to train people to do jobs. Inculcation of morality in the form of nationalistic pride is the next priority, but included in a negative way as a means for preventing the dissolution of society. Intellectual development has the lowest priority even for bright students, as society considers intellectualism unnecessary and somewhat odd. As a result of the low status of intellectual training, students are taught to do everything but think.

Similar concerns have been expressed by Downs (1975) in his description of the separation of material and moral advance. Downs argued that progress has brought only material development. Human beings have changed little since their humble beginnings and sometimes in a negative direction. Technological change has brought,

for example, both increased financial security and the dissolution of family ties.

The growth of technology has thus led to an emphasis in education on technical training, to the exclusion of moral and intellectual development. There can be no doubt that America requires competent technicians in every field. To develop leaders, however, whose decision making is divorced from moral, ethical, and human considerations would be to invite disaster. Gouldner (1964) has warned

> If today we concern curselves exclusively with the technical proficiency of our students and reject all responsibility for their moral sense, or lack of it, then we may someday be compelled to accept responsibility for having trained a generation willing to serve in a future Auschwitz. (p. 216)

Examination of the first two conflicts concerning traditional and emergent values suggests that leadership training focus on intellectual and moral development. Analysis of a third conflict points to curricular emphases on broad scholarship versus specialization.

With the gradual change from hunting-gathering to civilized ways of life, human beings gave up their egalitarian and independent status in favor of class stratification and occupational specialization. While specialization characterizes all civilizations, it is especially pronounced in industrial nations where rapid technological developments have resulted in the explosion of knowledge. Few individuals in modern society can acquire all the technical knowledge necessary to survive independently, but rely on the goods and services of many. Specialization has the advantage of making available an almost limitless variety of goods and services. It also permits expert analysis

of even the most exotic human or mechanical problem.

Specialization also has a price. In factories, assembly line employees each work with a small part of the whole and with little opportunity to understand the finished product. The assembly line mentality has pervaded other institutions as well. Medical patients are often referred to by their condition, rather than their names, and each aspect of their treatment is handled by a different specialist. One anthropological analysis of learning (Kimball, 1973) also likened the schools to factories that shape children. It is expected that decision makers in each of these institutions do perceive their respective products (goods, patients, and students) as wholes. It is hoped that they carefully consider how the separate actions of each specialist on each portion of the product affect every other part and ultimately, the whole.

Ideally, leaders must possess competence in all specializations that interface to form the domain over which they lead. Without such a broad understanding, decisions might be made to improve one sector that injures another, ultimately reducing the functioning of the whole. The experience of the Yir Yiront of Australia (Sharp, 1952) provides a classic example of decision making by well-intentioned individuals who lacked a broad perspective. To help the Yir Yiront increase their production, European missionaries gave steel axes to everyone--men, women, and children. They did not realize, however, that the indigenous stone axes were symbols of authority to be possessed only by men. This authority was objectified by women having

to borrow the axes of their men in order to do their wood cutting chores. The indiscriminate distribution of steel axes diminished male authority, disrupted trading practices, and contributed to the culture's disintegration.

Educators can help prepare better decision makers by developing curricula that permit students' attainment of competence in each discipline which can contribute to the students' chosen field. The following comment by biochemist R. G. H. Siu applies to leaders in every field: "Wise scientists are beginning to realize that a specialist is but an abstraction of man, a personality out of context" (in Gjessing, 1968, p. 397).

## Some Final Thoughts

Application of the anthropological perspective to educational issues can aid in their resolution by helping to clarify opposing values that coexist in the culture and serve as the source of these issues. Educators who are sensitive to the practices and values of subcultures in conflict with mainstream American culture will ultimately find ways to accommodate differences without sacrificing the goal of a better quality of life. Curriculum planners, fully aware of value conflicts within the culture as a whole, will of necessity resolve each issue in order to produce capable, moral leaders. These leaders, educated in broad and basic disciplines, will bring to decision making an understanding and appreciation of the problems and accomplishments of all sectors. Viewing each situation from a variety of perspectives, their solutions will provide for the continuance of American culture. Our survival depends on it.

References

Aceves, J. B., & King, H. G. Introduction to anthropology. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1979.

Berreman, G. D. Is anthropology alive? Social responsibility in social anthropology. Current Anthropology, 1968, 9(5), 391-396.

Cohen, R. A. Conceptual styles, culture conflict, and nonverbal tests of intelligence. American Anthropologist, 1969, 71(5), 828-856.

Downs, J. F. Cultures in crisis (2nd. ed.). Beverly Hills: Glencoe Publishing Co., 1975.

Emmons, F., & Cobia, J. Introducing anthropological concepts in the primary grades. Social Education, 1968, 32(3), 248-250.

Gjessing, G. The social responsibility of the social scientist. Current Anthropology, 1968, 9(5), 397-402.

Gough, K. New proposals for anthropologists. Current Anthropology, 1968, 9(5), 403-407.

Gouldner, A. Anti-minotaur: The myth of a value-free sociology. In I. L. Horowitz (Ed.), The new sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Henry, J. Culture against man. New York: Vintage Books, 1963.

Jackson, P. W. Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Jordan, C. The culturally sensitive selection of teaching practices. Paper presented in the symposium, Direct Instruction of Reading Comprehension, at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Kimball, S. T. An anthropological view of social system and learning. In F. A. J. Ianni & E. Story (Eds.), Cultural relevance and educational issues. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1973.

Kneller, G. F. Educational anthropology: An introduction. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.

LaBelle, T. J. An anthropological framework for studying education. In J. I. Roberts & S. K. Akinsanya (Eds.), Educational patterns and cultural configurations. New York: David McKay Co., 1976.

Leeds, A. Considerations regarding anthropology in high school curricula. Human Organization, 1961, 2(3), 134-140.

Malinowski, B. Native education and culture contact. International Review of Missions, 1936, 25.

Price-Williams, D., & Gallimore, R. The cultural perspective. Advances in special education (Vol. 2). JAI Press, Inc., 1980.

Roberts, J. I. An overview of anthropology and education. In J. I. Roberts & S. K. Akinsanya (Eds.), Educational patterns and cultural configurations. New York: David McKay Co., 1976.

Rosenfeld, G. L. Anthropology as social studies in the elementary school. Teachers College Record, 1968, 69(8), 767-770.

Schmidt, P. F. Some criticisms of cultural relativism. The Journal of Philosophy, 1955, 52(25), 780-791.

Sharp, L. Steel axes for stone-age Australians. Human Organization, 1952, 11, 17-22.

Spindler, G. D. Anthropology and education: An overview. In F. A. J. Ianni & E. Storey (Eds.), Cultural relevance and educational issues. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1973.

Tharp, R. G. The direct instruction of comprehension: Results and description of the Kamehameha Early Childhood Education Program. Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1850 Makuakane Street, Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817. Undated.

Wallace, A. F. C. Schools in revolutionary and conservative societies. In F. A. J. Ianni & E. Storey (Eds.), Cultural relevance and educational issues. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1973.

Wilson, S. The use of ethnographic techniques in educational research. Review of Educational Research, 1977, 47(1), 245-265.